Appl. No.: 10/711,822

Response dated March 17, 2008

Reply to Restriction Requirement of Feb. 26, 2008

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS** 

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, and 11 are amended.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended for clarity and to correct an editorial error whereby references to the top plate were made while the bottom plate is the correct reference. Support for such amendments may be found throughout the specification and figures.

Claim 3 is amended to add terms describing the web of the thermal framing component to provide consistency with the terminology used in claim 9. Support for such amended may be further found in Applicant's specification paragraph [0030] (including the application incorporated by reference therein) and throughout the figures.

Claim 7 is amended as an editorial change.

Claim 9 is amended to reflect the antecedent basis of the elongated planar web recited in claim 3, from which claim 9 depends.

FIG. 1 is amended for clarity to coincide with the reference to section line 2—2 made in paragraph [0017] in the Brief Description of the Drawings in Applicant's specification.

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner indicated that the present application includes claims to the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1-12 and 14-18 drawn to a thermal wall system and associated method of assembly, classified in class 052, subclass 481.1.
- II. Claim 13, drawing to a thermal end cap, classified in class 052, subclass 459.

TRI1\670232v1 12

Appl. No.: 10/711,822

Response dated March 17, 2008

Reply to Restriction Requirement of Feb. 26, 2008

In response to the Restriction Requirement by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 121, the Applicant provisionally elects for examination of Group I, claims 1-12 and 14-18. The Applicant traverses the restriction requirement.

The Applicant submits that the examination of the two Groups should be performed together, as the search for these claims may all be done concurrently and the effort for the Examiner to examine all of these claims is not unduly burdensome as compared to examining one of the Groups. The subclassification difference is not so different as to justify a need for separate search efforts.

## **CONCLUSION**

As discussed, the search and examination of the claims in the Groups set forth above does not pose a serious burden to the Examiner. In contrast, the cost to the Applicant of pursuing the Groups is substantial. It is respectfully submitted that the Amendments presented herein place the claim in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions about the present Response or the Amendment made herein, a telephone interview is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald R. Moody et al. (Applicant)

Date: 17 Merch 2008

By: Matthew W. Witsil
Registration No. 47,183
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
430 Davis Drive, Suite 500

P.O. Box 13706

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Telephone: (919) 286-8000 Facsimile: (919) 286-8199

TRII\670232vI 13